

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 17, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement imposed under 35 U.S.C. § 121 is respectfully requested.

A restriction to one of Species A shown in Figure 3, Species B shown in Figure 5, Species C shown in Figure 6, Species D shown in Figure 9, Species E shown in Figure 10, and Species F shown in Figure 11, was imposed. Applicants elect, with traverse, Species B for prosecution on the merits. Applicants submit that at least Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, and 20 read on Species B. At least Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 14, 16, and 20 are generic to all of Species A, B, C, D, E, and F.

The requirement for election is traversed because Species A, B, C, D, E, and F are clearly related. A thorough search and examination of one Species would be relevant to the examination of the other Species.

Regarding Species A, B, C, D, E, and F, the Examiner notes that “[t]he species are independent or distinct because they are unconnected in design, operation and effect.” Applicants note, however, that Species A, B, C, D, E, and F are all directed to systems for dispensing a liquid including a reservoir, at least one dispenser, and a plurality of tubes, as set forth in at least independent Claims 1, 10, and 16. Also, Species B, C, D, E, and F, shown in Figures 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11, respectively, include at least the features of Species A. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that it is evident that the claims of Species A, B, C, D, E, and F have an overlapping nature such that a search and examination of Species A, B, C, D, E, and F can be made without serious burden.

MPEP section 803 states that if “the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the search and examination of the entire application (Species A, B, C, D, E, and F) can be made without serious burden. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request examination of Species A, B, C, D, E, and F.

In addition, requirements for election are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. § 121. Accordingly, reconsideration of the restriction requirement is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric T. Krischke
Eric T. Krischke
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070